

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-2 and 4-11, drawn to a method of controlling fertility by administration of a GnRH agonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 1 and 3-11, drawn to a method of controlling fertility by administration of a GnRH antagonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- III. Claims 12-13 and 15-21, drawn to a method of contraception by administration of a GnRH agonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- IV. Claims 12 and 14-21, drawn to a method of contraception by administration of a GnRH antagonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- V. Claims 22-23, 25-37 and 39-48, drawn to a method of treating sex hormone related disease by administration of a GnRH agonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- VI. Claims 22, 24-36 and 38-48, drawn to a method of treating sex hormone related disease by administration of a GnRH antagonist, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.

- VII. Claims 49-59, drawn to a method of promoting release of LH/FSH, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- VIII. Claims 60-70, drawn to a method of preventing LH/FSH release, classified in at least class 514, subclass 2.
- IX. Claims 71-72 and 73, drawn to a GnRH analog, classified in class 530, subclass 300, for example.
- X. Claim 73, drawn to a GnRH antagonist, classified in class 530, subclass 300, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions IX and (I, III, V, VII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the analog of Group IX could be used in any one of the methods of Groups I, III, V or VII.

Inventions X and (II, IV, VI and VIII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the antagonist of Group X could be used in any one of the methods of Groups II, IV, VI or VIII.

Inventions IX and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different effects. The molecules of Groups IX and X are directed to molecules which have opposite effects as one is an agonist and one is an antagonist.

Inventions I-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are directed to methods which have different designs, modes of operation and effects. The methods have different goals, have different patient populations and use different compounds (based on agonists versus antagonists).

Inventions IX and (II, IV, VI and VIII) are directed to an unrelated product and process. Product and process inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that the product cannot be used in, or made by, the process. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06. In the instant case, the processes of Groups (II, IV, VI and VIII) do not use the product of Group IX.

Inventions X and (I, III, V, and VII) are directed to an unrelated product and process. Product and process inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that the product cannot be used in, or made by, the process. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06. In the instant case, the processes of Groups (I, III, V, and VII) do not use the product of Group X.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election

shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine J. Saoud whose telephone number is 571-272-0891. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6AM-2PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christine J Saoud/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

\*\*\*